UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/580,365	05/26/2000	Stephen Dao Hui Hsu	004828.P001	8126

7590	02/12/2007
Stephen Dao Hui Hsu	
3150 Beech Street	
Eugene, OR 97405	

EXAMINER
TRAN, TONGOC

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2134	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/12/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07 November 2006</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>73-92</u> is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>73-92</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

     1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

     2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

     3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Office Action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed on

November 7, 2006. Claims 73-72 have been canceled. Claims 73-92 have

added. Claims 73-92 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 73-77 and 79-84 and 89-92 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Obenhuber et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,144,638) in view of

Farah ("Encrypted Hypertext Transfer Protocol-UGGC/1.0", April, 2000, Network

Working Group", pages 1-5).

In respect claims 73, 74, 76, 81-84, 89 and 90, Obenhuber discloses a

method, a server system and a computer-readable memory medium comprising:

At a server outside of a firewall, receiving over a secure connection,

encrypted data from a computer behind said firewall (see Fig. 4 and col. 4, lines

1-50), wherein said server is accessible via a first Internet domain, wherein said

receiving over said secure connection includes decrypting said encrypted data

according to a protocol specified by said secure connection to produce encrypted

data, said server decrypting the encrypted address of the web page; responsive

to said decrypting, said server retrieving the web page via the second Internet

domain; and said server sending data to said computer over the secure

connection via he firewall, wherein said sending data includes encrypting said

data, wherein said encrypted data includes said retrieved web page (see col. 4,

lines 20-35). Obenhuber does not disclose wherein the request includes both an

encrypted address of the web page and an unencrypted address of a third

Internet domain that is different from said second Internet domain. However,

Farah discloses encrypting the URL address or partially encrypting the URL

address (see Farrah, pages 2-3). Furthermore, Official Notice is taken that URL

address containing addresses from at least one domains (e.g. URL that contains

source host with partner site). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made incorporate the partial

encryption of Farrah by encrypting the webpage in the URL in order to protect the

directory of the requested files.

In respect to claims 75 and 91, Obenhuber and Farrah do not disclose

wherein the third Internet domain is the same as the first Internet domain.

However, it is old and well known to include returned address in the file request.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to concatenate the returned url of the user

request in the request in unencrypted form taught by Farrah's partial encrypted

URL as a matter of design.

In respect to claim 77, Obenhuber further discloses wherein said protocol specified by said secure connection is SSL (see col. 9, lines 20-25).

In respect to claims 79 and 92, Obenhuber does not disclose providing advertisement to the computer. However, Official Notice is taken that providing advertisement to the computer over the Internet in exchange for service provided is old and well known. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement advertising feature to Obenhuber's customer system in order to exchange for service provided.

In respect to claim 80, Obenhuber further discloses providing information regarding one or more web pages requested by said computer to one or more third parties (see col. 4, lines 1-9).

3.   Claims 78 and 85-88 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Obenhuber et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,144,638) in view of Farah ("Encrypted Hypertext Transfer Protocol-UGGC/1.0", April, 2000, Network Working Group", pages 1-5) and further in view of Subramaniam et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,640,302, hereinafter Subramaniam).

In respect to claims 78 and 85-88, Obenhuber does not disclose modifying computer code associated with the retrieved web page to cause subsequent requests from the computer that are related to the retrieved web page to be sent to the third Internet domain instead of the second internet domain. However,

Subramaniam discloses redirection capability to redirect from one domain to

another domain (see col. 9, lines 22-60). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the

redirection signal taught by Subramaniam with Obenhuber's providing users with

access to public work for the benefit of promoting the use of secure connection

(see col. 9, lines 23-25).

Response to Arguments

4.   Applicant's arguments filed 11/7/2006 have been fully considered but they

are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the cited prior art fails to teach

"wherein said request includes both an encrypted address of said web page and

an unencrypted address of a third Internet domain that is different from said

second Internet domain" and "wherein said sending data includes encrypting said

data, wherein said encrypted data includes said retrieved web page". However,

Farrah discloses URL that are fully encrypted or partially encrypted. The partial

encryption of the URL address makes it obvious to encrypt the desire portion of

the files to be protected. Obenhuber discloses data are encrypted in order to

protect its secrecy while transmitted over the network (see col. 4, lines 21-35).

Applicant further argues that the cited prior art fails to teach "said server

retrieving the web page via the second Internet domain; said server sending data

to said computer over the secure connection via the firewall". However,

Obenhuber teaches customer accessing WAN through LAN's firewall meets the

claim limitation.

Conclusion

4.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from

the examiner should be directed to Tongoc Tran whose telephone number is

(571) 272-3843. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the

examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on (571) 272-3799. The

fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is

assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from

the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information

for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public

PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-

free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service

Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-

9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

KAMBIZ ZAND
PRIMARY EXAMINER

TT
February 5, 2007